

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/802,585	03/17/2004	Le Huang		3879	
7	590 06/12/2006		EXAMINER		
Mai De Ltd.			RAO, DE	RAO, DEEPAK R	
P. O. Box 193 Northborough,	MA 01532		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
,			1624		
			DATE MAILED: 06/12/2000	6	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	-
	10/802,585	HUANG, LE	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Deepak Rao	1624	
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence ac	ddress
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REI WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory per - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the material patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	B DATE OF THIS COMMUNI R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a find will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON atute, cause the application to become Al	CATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this of BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ▼ T 3) Since this application is in condition for allow	his action is non-final.	ters, prosecution as to th	e merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under	•	•	
Disposition of Claims	,,	,	
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-33 a/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are without 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) □ Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-33 are subject to restriction and/	drawn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Example 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the contained The oath or declaration is objected to by the	accepted or b) objected to the drawing(s) be held in abeyang rection is required if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). g(s) is objected to. See 37 C	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the papplication from the International Bur * See the attached detailed Office action for a	ents have been received. ents have been received in A priority documents have been reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No received in this National	l Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)	
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/Paper No(s)/Mail Date 		(s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PT 	⁻ O-152)

Application/Control Number: 10/802,585 Page 2

Art Unit: 1624

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-33 are pending in this application.

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- Claims 1-7 and 28-33, drawn to anhydrous amorphous form of rosuvastatin calcium and corresponding pharmaceutical composition, classified in class 544, subclass 330.
- II. Claims 1-7 and 28-33, drawn to anhydrous amorphous form of pitavastatin calcium and corresponding composition, classified in class 546, subclass 173.
- III. Claims 1-7 and 28-33, drawn to anhydrous amorphous form of fluvastatin sodium, classified in class 548, subclass 494.
- IV. Claims 8-17, drawn to a process for the preparation of anhydrous amorphous form of rosuvastatin calcium, classified in class 544, subclass 330.
- V. Claims 8-17, drawn to a process for the preparation of anhydrous amorphous form of pitavastatin calcium, classified in class 546, subclass 173.
- VI. Claims 8-17, drawn to a process for the preparation of anhydrous amorphous form of fluvastatin sodium, classified in class 548, subclass 494.
- VII. Claims 18-27, drawn to another process for the preparation of anhydrous amorphous form of rosuvastatin calcium, classified in class 544, subclass 330.
- VIII. Claims 18-27, drawn to another process for the preparation of anhydrous amorphous form of pitavastatin calcium, classified in class 546, subclass 173.

Art Unit: 1624

IX. Claims 18-27, drawn to another process for the preparation of anhydrous amorphous form of fluvastatin calcium, classified in class 548, subclass 494.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

The compounds of Groups I-III are drawn to structurally dissimilar compounds. They are made independently and used independently. They would be expected to raise different issues of patentability if a compound of Group I was anticipated, the anticipatory reference would not necessarily render obvious a compound of groups II-III or vice-versa. They are not art-recognized equivalents, they are separately classified and require separate burdensome searches both in the literature and computer databases.

Each of inventions IV-VI and VII-IX are unrelated, they are drawn compounds and process of preparation of another structurally dissimilar compound. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions of Groups IV-VI or VII-IX have different function or effect, i.e., each invention produces a structurally different product. The different inventions IV and VII; V and VIII; VI and IX are different because they are drawn to materially different processes.

Inventions IV-VI, VII-IX and I-III are related as process of making and product made.

The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make another and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the

Application/Control Number: 10/802,585

Art Unit: 1624

instant case the anhydrous amorphous product may be made by materially different process using different reagents.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

This restriction is being set forth in writing due to its lengthy nature and to facilitate applicant with sufficient information, to make an informed and correct election of the invention applicants would wish to have prosecuted in the application.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found

Art Unit: 1624

allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai, In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.

Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Deepak Rao whose telephone number is (571) 272-0672. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday from 6:30am to 5:00pm.

Application/Control Number: 10/802,585 Page 6

Art Unit: 1624

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James O. Wilson, can be reached at (571) 272-0661. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Deepak Rao Primary Examiner Art Unit 1624

June 8, 2006